



Everything has bias.
The bias of anarchistnews.org is to promote an anarchist culture by providing a non-sectarian source of news and commentary about and of interest to anarchists.

original publication and author given when available

selected stories from anarchistnews.org

Digest of the Anarchist Tubes

compiled from July 2017

volume 3, #8

ATUBES

TOTW: Don't Get Trolled

by thecollective

This week's topic is near and dear to our hearts. Sometimes entertaining and often frustrating, trolling as a phenomenon is endemic to modern discourse, and this is especially true of political spaces. From people who veer discussions wildly off-topic with seemingly unrelated opinions to those who provoke frustration or even anger with opinions with which we disagree strongly, we are presented daily with complicated social interactions both online and offline. Trolls, by nature of their often provocative views and tendency to dominate discussions, may leave us feeling overwhelmed and ill-prepared to do anything but try and ignore them.

This topic of the week is about taking a more proactive stance on trolling without getting pulled into the cycle of trolling itself. Much as trolling often snowballs, on-topic comments which actively engage with the original topic of discussion or engage with it in a less unpleasant way can pull people out of the troll-spiral.

What are some concrete ways to shape a discussion to be interesting and engaging when we see it going off the rails?

How can we make conversations that we don't feel included in or feel frustrated with more interesting to us? How do we challenge views we disagree with without engaging in the often fruitless and unpleasant task of trying to engage a troll directly?

Here are some suggestions from the collective - we'd love to hear more in the comments!

1. Point out something you like, don't like, or are confused about in the original topic of discussion
2. Mention something you're reminded of in your past experiences or something you've read before that agrees or disagrees with the original piece - offering a link to a related article can help slow the discussion down and get people more involved in a more interesting way
3. Offer a deeper analysis of an article - is what the piece is saying new or old? What kind of anarchy is it describing?
4. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments presented? What is it a good example of? What is it a bad example of?
5. What would your favorite historical anarchist say about this?

Read the comments here: <https://tinyurl.com/yauld3tl>

This is a pretty important

a comment <https://tinyurl.com/yaaaofl5>

This is a pretty important question, though I don't know about framing it around trolls. To me, the question is if it's possible for an anonymous, open platform for anarchist discussion on the internet to be useful or if it will always be swallowed by its worst elements.

Rather than focus on what's a troll and how to react to them, I'd rather focus on the proposals the TOTW sets out about how to contribute to a useful discussion. I'd suggest that the problem with the comments on a-news isn't primarily a moderation issue or the presence of a handful of annoying people -- we can all contribute to using this platform in a way that's interesting to us. Submit texts that you want to discuss, take a few minutes to write out introductions or critiques, respond to the critical, content oriented aspects of comments (rather than to tone or who you think wrote it) or ignore the comment.

I don't want us all to retreat to facebook or whatever. I don't like that there are no comments on IGD. I think we can do better than what's been happening on here lately if we decide we value this platform and put in a bit of energy to make it look like what we want to see, in spite of the trolls

An Open Letter Concerning a Witch-Hunt

from anarchist news by Wolfi Landstreicher

Yesterday morning (Sunday, July 16, 2017), I received two emails from two different sources with a link to a diatribe on a web site called The Conjure House denouncing me because of the publishing house that published my translation of Stirner's *The Unique*. Had I not received these emails, I would have known nothing of this, because I choose to have a minimal relationship with the internet. The internet originated in military research. Its functioning makes it an ideal tool for police work: gathering, extracting, combining, twisting and inventing "information" that may have some relations to actual existence or not, but that can cast the appearance of "guilt" on whatever target one chooses. I assume from the start that everything that goes on the internet gets into the hands of cops of one sort or another, so when I do use the internet, I do it with care. After all, I do not want to accidentally incriminate myself, nor to accidentally snitch on someone else, whether to state cops or to the wannabe cops of political correctness in anarchist circles (both self-incrimination and accidental snitching seem to be frequent occurrences in internet interactions). That is why in this statement, which I am writing so that others who choose to can post or republish this, the only names you will see are Kevin Slaughter, Underworld Amusements, Loompanics (because they are no longer in business), Dr. Bones and my own (at the end of this statement). No other names are relevant to what I have to say and these have already been made public in this situation. I'll start by putting forth the facts from my perspective:

I began working on my translation of Stirner's *The Unique and Its Property* shortly after finishing my translations of Stirner's *Critics* and *The Philosophical Reactionaries*. After some positive responses to these translations, I felt confident in my ability to do it. I had ideas about who I would like to publish *The Unique*, but made no agreement until it was pretty much finished. The person through whom I would most have liked to publish it had been having trouble getting money together to do his own projects, and there didn't seem to be any sign of an end to this lack of funds in sight, so I assumed that was not a possibility. If I didn't say this directly to him, my apologies to him for my lack of communication. Another anarchist publisher offered, and I considered it seriously (despite whatever differences we may have on certain things, I consider these people friends, and anyone saying otherwise is wrong and doesn't understand how I relate to people – and besides, it's the sort of thing NOT to say in public forums – so tales of "bad blood" are tall tales). But I had seen some of their books come out with major problems in layout and the like, and I didn't want that for this book. Apparently they had planned to have someone else do the layout and printing for this, but I somehow missed that (or forgot it) and that is my fault, and to them I also offer apologies for my unawareness/forgetfulness. But the concern about quality was what made me look for another publisher, even if it was a mistaken concern. I wanted to find a small anarchist press (not either of the bigger anarchist publishers who, in any case, weren't likely to be willing to print anything I was involved with) with the means to do a book of this size, but I wasn't aware of any others who had that capacity at that time (much later, I did learn of one other). And had I not missed the fact that the publishers mentioned above had planned to have it put together by an outside printer, I most likely would have gone with them. While pondering over where to publish, a friend of mine – whom I have known since the late 1980s, who had been active in the anarchist zine culture when I met him – gave me a suggestion. He had had a couple of egoist-related books published by Underworld Amusements (UA) and had made me gifts of those books. So I knew that they were well put-together, well-edited and well-printed. At that time, I went to the UA website. What I found that UA published itself were egoist, satanist, pessimist and vintage pornographic books. Their distribution also included anarchist books and some of what I can only call "in-your-face-outsider" books. I did not see a single book in the UA distro that was fascist, white supremacist or any such thing. In fact, their distro reminded me of the theoretical part of the Loompanics distro, a bit darker and more pessimistic, but parallel in many ways. For those unfamiliar with Loompanics, it was a publishing and distribution project started by a market anarchist in 1975 that continued until around 2006. During the 1980s and well into the 1990s, Loompanics helped facilitate a lot of the lively intense debates going on in the anarchist zine scene between different anarchist ideas.

Read the rest here: <https://tinyurl.com/ycgq2lwz>

and a comment from Wolfi response:

Hey, Bones - how about a more substantive response?

By BellamyOfFRR

Your account featured sensationalized claims that were highly dubious at the time and that now seem obviously false, such as "It is a tale of Wolfi Landstreicher associating an entire philosophy with the most putrid of politics for a few dollars in his bank account." and "A book seven years in the making, a new translation that could have blossomed into a renaissance for Egoism, was published through an outfit run by a racist because the motherfuckers at Little Black Cart wouldn't pay him. Wolfi had worked on a painstaking translation and, strapped for cash, sold it to a fascist without any hesitation [...]"

You had insufficient evidence to make these claims that you phrased in very strong language. You placed them in bold and italicized font and made them the eye-grabbing introduction and climax of the piece, respectively. You now write, "I never said Wolfi was a fascist." - no, but you said he was a sellout and you misrepresented what occurred between him and the folks at LBC. These are very damaging claims. You participated in the toxic accusation tendency of the NA@ subculture in which accused people are assumed guilty until proven otherwise, in which the histrionic outrage of accusers is regularly socially rewarded, and in which the cooler heads among third parties who ask for clarification and reserve judgement are often told to do things like "drink ethylene glycol" for potentially being on the wrong side of the line in the sand. Please don't do these things that lower our level of discourse and thinking - it is seriously annoying and destructive behavior.

One might infer that you intentionally sensationalized the affair for personal gain, given that you spread your story widely online, dramatized yourself as some sort of muckraker, and included ads for your writing and Patreon. But perhaps you are just easily excited and prone to logical leaps. Either way, don't you think an at least minimal acknowledgement of these overstatements is appropriate?

From <https://tinyurl.com/y7s4nea9>

ATUBES EDITOR'S NOTE: Doctor Bones never really responded in our humble opinion, instead just declaring a social media victory. #Sad. They have since taken their original txt down from their website, but you can still read it on @news.

Wolfi, if telling the truth,

a comment by Anonymous (not verified)

Wolfi, if telling the truth, I have very little problem with. Don't know about spending a second bashing the right wing egoist, in a way that sorta guilts anyone uneasy with their association and then a few pages laying into the left wing egoist, but from what I can gather of a sorta tired of people's bullshit old hand angry at getting dragged into this drama without any sorta warning, I understand, especially with how Bones went about it.

Dr. Bones, I think had a worthwhile goal (if someone whose friendly with white nationalists, likely a racist and pro-eugenics is making money off this shit and no one knows, that's worth exposing) but handled it, as many have said, like an immature social justice warrior eager to prove to the rest of the left that yes, egoists can be just as fast to drop the hammer on some perceived misstep and all that. The screen captures of quotes from Wolfi's friendlies that indicate very little, and the rush from concerning shit to speculate about to "here's proof you're a sinner, what do YOOOOOOOU have to say" is kinda disgusting, though endemic to the world he seems to operate on.

Slaughter seems like a total sketchball whose keeping his real cards close to his chest. From what is online it's impossible to tell if he's a Feral House/Loompanicsesque edgelord, a right wing egoist, or a fascist entryist. How I feel depends on that a lot, and I've yet to read any statement on that, which makes me suspect the worst.

I think Dr. Bones should've aimed at Underworld instead of Wolfi. He gets enough reads that an expose of fascists infiltrating egoism woulda gotten attention and still gotten word out that this book has a questionable publisher without having to make the target someone with no interest in online leftist drama who seems to have just not known any better. Wolfi may have taken heed without the need for all this nonsense.

from: <https://tinyurl.com/y7ouok6g>

“Eco-extremism and the indiscriminate attack – The Church of ITS Mexico”

From 325 by L (UK)

“And Severino Di Giovanni’s actions were never violent for the sake of it. They were never indiscriminate or striking at anything at all in order to create a tension that would favour power and it’s politics of consolidation. They were always guided by a precise revolutionary reasoning: to strike the centres of power with punitive actions that find their justification in the State’s violence, and which were aimed at pushing the mass towards a revolutionary objective. Di Giovanni always took account of the situation of the mass, even though he was often accused of not having done so” JW & AMB

- Anarchism and Violence / Severino Di Giovanni in Argentina by Osvaldo Bayer / Elephant Editions

I don’t represent any organisation or group, I am writing this from my personal perspective, as nihilist-anarchist of an anti-civilisation insurrectional tendency. I have carried out direct action in defense of the Earth, so the state and society would probably view me as an “Eco-Extremist”, although I’m unconcerned with this term as it’s become a sect-like ideology of the Church. I haven’t written before about the Church of ITS Mexico or the idiot pseudo-nihilist(s) in Italy because over the last few years they clearly became reactionary and more akin to far-right ‘black’ groups.

It has been some years since the Church of ITS Mexico said something like that ‘the FAI doesn’t represent us’, that the ‘CCF doesn’t represent us’... Well I can’t recall anything like that being said by CCF or FAI or anyone else in the first place, so why is the ITS Church still issuing sermons about it now and why have they not embarked on a one-way trip far away from the black anarchy they proclaim is irrelevant and gone off into the nihilising abyss like they said they would, leaving all us anarchist nuns alone?

It was obvious to foresee what this group and their related neurotic fanclub was going towards – cultish green authoritarianism, paganism, irrationalism and indiscriminate attacks – and haven’t we seen this before? Although the Church of ITS Mexico with its tiny few self-described eco-extremists and pseudo-nihilists like to pose as the most radical and truly anarchistic and chaotic latest trend that is very different and abyssal, far from anything that goes before, they are just another offshoot of an old idea with rotten roots in soil and blood, either that or they just have shit for brains.

The murders that ITS Mexico has done in their current phase and the words that accompany the actions are those of one of the enemies, no equivocation – it doesn’t matter at this point what justifications and philosophical manipulations they use to explain how they became irrationalist fanatics. Those who indiscriminately attack regular people are authoritarians and would-be dictators, mass killers, and they and their fanclub of sychophants brag and boast as such behind a myriad of regressive ideas.

Reactionary, nationalist, neo-nazi, racist and pagan networks converging inward autonomously in Europe at least, is nothing new, because for decades we can find their groups dwelling in a spectrum of misanthropic nihilist-right planes of thought, often informed by various degrees of biocentrism, traditionalism, green authoritarianism, anti-humanism, anti-progress etc. It’s easy to find their blogs with old runic indigenous obscurantism, glorification of mass murder, death camps, genocide imagery and glorification of weapons and killing.

In the UK in the 90’s, a tiny few anarcho-primitivists also flirted with this eco-fascist thinking which had seeped in amongst ‘when animals attack’-type stories and news-clippings about earthquakes and plagues, in the newspaper ‘Green Anarchist’. The idea was that indiscriminate attacks and/or mass killings of people are justified as ‘war against civilisation/society’. There was a split in the newspaper ‘Green Anarchist’ about the topic (‘The Irrationalists’ by Steve Booth). One of the editors left and started an eco-fascist paper. Green Anarchist continued to provide lists of direct actions which were taking place and had articles and reports. The controversy came during an operation by the state against the earth and animal liberation movement which was strong at the time (so-called GANDALF operation). The state spent millions of pounds trying to shut GA down and one of their editors was jailed. Looking back on the text that started the affair it is nothing in comparison to the shit that ITS Mexico have been spewing for the last few years, a hex upon them.

Read more: <https://tinyurl.com/yaw2mybh>

An Anarchist FAQ after 21 years

From Anarchist Writers

For reasons too unimportant to discuss here, the 20th anniversary blog for An Anarchist FAQ (AFAQ) ended up on my personal blog rather than AFAQ's "official" one. Now I correct this by reposting it here as well as taking the opportunity to preface it with a few comments to mark 21 years since AFAQ was officially launched.

This year, 2017, marks numerous anarchist related anniversaries besides AFAQ's – most obviously, 100 years since the Russian Revolution (see section A.5.4). Given subsequent events, it is easy to forget that the overthrow of the Tsar was initially – and rightly – viewed as great event by all on the left. As information of the increasing social nature of the revolt – what Voline termed The Unknown Revolution – became better known, the far-left was increasingly enthused by the revolution: workers had formed soviets and were starting to organise unions and factory committees, peasants were taking back the land, and so on. The revolution – as Anarchists alone had argued during the failed revolution of 1905 – was going beyond political reform into a social revolution. Reports of the new, radical and functionally based democracy were avidly read across the Left and especially by Anarchists – it appeared that our vision of social revolution was coming true.

By the early 1920s, Anarchists had broken with the new regime. Accounts of the dictatorial nature of the Bolsheviks could no longer be ignored – particularly when coming from eye-witnesses like Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman as well as the reports of the delegates from syndicalist unions sent to the Second Congress of the Communist International and that of the newly formed Red International of Labour Unions. However, what Berkman termed The Bolshevik Myth held sway in the non-Anarchist left in spite of these facts becoming available. While this myth was slowly eroded as the evils of the regime became harder and harder to ignore, the damage had been done: the liberatory promise of revolution and of socialism became associated with its opposite.

Anarchists were not surprised that State socialism became a new class system – we had, after all, predicted this from Proudhon and Bakunin onwards. However, this did not stop many on the left believing The Bolshevik Myth and today there are still many grouplets on the left (with impressive names which reflect aspirations rather than reality) which denounce Stalinism while seeking the "genuine" socialism of the Bolsheviks. As part of its goal to be a resource for Anarchists, AFAQ sought to show the links between the regime of Lenin and Trotsky and that of Stalin. It sought to show the ideological roots of the degeneration of the Revolution and to show that the post-hoc explanations first postulated by Trotsky and regurgitated by Leninists to this day were inadequate.

This was part of the aim of section H (on Marxism) and I think it was successful. Originally, it was going to be much bigger, too big as it turned out. So sections on the Russian Revolution which were originally planned to be in section H (including ones on Kronstadt and the Makhnovists) were moved to an appendix. This appendix, as noted in the 20th anniversary blog, is still incomplete but its most important points have been placed in section H, particularly in section H.6 which summarises why the Russian Revolution failed and, just as importantly, that anarchist warnings were proven correct. It shows how that favourite post-hoc excuse of Marxists – "objective circumstances" – does not explain what happened and how ideological and structural factors are much more significant.

Read more: <https://tinyurl.com/ya7wg9z3>

Fuck this FAQ. This FAQ has

a comment from: <https://tinyurl.com/yc37ojzc>

Fuck this FAQ. This FAQ has done a disservice to the anarchist milieu and is both limited and partisan to left anarchist thinking. The authors, primarily anarcho-communists of syndicalist and platformist backgrounds, slant defining anarchy within a limited tradition and disparage other anarchist tendencies instead of requesting authors from those backgrounds write the sections or, failing that, write actually well sourced and perspective friendly sections on post left anarchy, anarcho-primitivism, the temporary autonomous zone and many other features of actually existing anarchy that the FAQ purposely fudges for partisan gain. I'm disgusted by the authors, who deliberately go out of their way to underplay elements of anarchy outside their little bubbles.

A Block of The Brilliant

From The Brilliant

It's been a while since we've updated @news on the ongoing (usually twice a month) podcast The Brilliant. If you'd like to stay up to the minute on the podcast make sure to check the RSS feed. In the past few months we have...

Interviewed NYC anarchist-nihilist-performer Kalan

Discussed the 1980's documentary Call it Sleep with Isaac Cronin

Had an informal discussion with the editor of the Atassa journal

Discussed ITS with Bellamy

If you'd like to chat drop us a line at our email address.

Stupid Facebook

Also check out the Anarchist News podcast

Read [listen] more: <https://tinyurl.com/ycb7bb29>

Episode 50

A comment from H: <https://tinyurl.com/y8rwtjtf>

I think this is the best episode in this latest batch of conversations between Aragorn! and his guests. The back and forth between Aragorn! and Bellamy on matters related to ITS, nihilism, and Anarchy Radio provided several points of clarification that careful listeners should have recognized. With respect to the way the subject of nihilism has been treated by John Zerzan in his weekly radio program, let me offer a few snippets from 2016. During the presidential primary season, there was a broadcast of Anarchy Radio in which Zerzan, in a moment of pique, compared Aragorn! with Trump, suggesting that Trump like Aragorn! is an embodiment of the fact free, knowledge free post-modern man. To say the least, this was a low blow. No wonder then that there is bad blood between Aragorn! and Bellamy on one hand and Zerzan and Tucker on the other. In another episode of Anarchy Radio from last year, Zerzan had a guest, a friendly guest, who described himself as an Anarcho-Primitivist with some leanings towards nihilism. Since Zerzan is confounded by nihilism, this was an opportunity to get some clarification. But Zerzan did not ask his guest any questions about nihilism. Perhaps there is a strain of nihilism that informs, perhaps subconsciously, the varieties of anarchy, including BACK TO THE STONE AGE OR BUST Anarcho-Primitivists. After all, it was John Zerzan who remarked to Kevin Tucker "It's all gonna have to go"-full spectrum negation. And where does ITS fit into this discussion? They are a painful reminder that Anarchist Resistance to date has accomplished little and changed nothing. The March of techno-capitalism has not been retarded by a single inch since the Seattle protests in 1999. No DAPL changed nothing. The J20 protesters, some of whom engaged in minor property destruction, are facing a federal prosecutor (an Obama appointee) who is calling for lengthy prison sentences. There is no point in saying smash as in smash the state or abolish as in abolish capitalism unless one is prepared to do more than storm the barricades, break some windows, destroy automatic teller machines, torch a cop car, or blow up a scientific lab. The only other alternative to violence that I can imagine that could lead to transformation is withdrawal and abandonment- call it "New elements of Refusal"(are you listening JZ?). If the "Myth of the Machine" is widely mocked, debunked, and discarded, we may see a flowering of new possibilities for social transformation. Or we may see a combination of revolution and refusal. Or we could remain where we are. Who really knows? But I am not in the Impossible camp, because I do not accept the tenets of historical necessity or historical determinism.

I can save you some time

a comment from BellamyOfFRR [<https://tinyurl.com/y8p4mgz2>]

Here are paraphrases of comments I have made on podcasts that have been construed as my supporting EE and for which I have been criticized in the past:

- I have said numerous times in different ways (including on The Brilliant) that trumpeting moral horror about indiscriminate attack while supporting one of the 57 varieties of social change through violent revolution (including those not openly called "revolution") is at the very least a dubious position, if not in fact a contradictory or delusional one (depending on the particulars of the revolutionary stance) - this is the position most vocal critics of

(continued on next page)

EE hold, and I have pointed out in writing that the most vociferous critics of EE have more in common with them than they may acknowledge. I have also made clear numerous times that I think **neither** indiscriminate attack **nor** revolution will get us to anything like an anarchy I would like to see.

- I have said that the EEs recognize something many anarchists are uncomfortable with recognizing: that our crisis is as much one of mass submission as it is of coercion. I completely reject, however, the moralistic misanthropy of the EEs - i.e., humans are not good enough for the world because our deity Ajajema said so.

- I said back in the FRR days, when EE was first becoming well-known in the US anarchist milieu, that I could understand, *prima facie*, why someone would want to "destroy something that is ugly to [them]". The people around Black and Green Review made a big fuss about this line, criticized me in print as supporting EE, and I responded to them on FRR.

I have **also** said:

- EEs are not nihilists by any reasonable definition of the word, not by a long shot - they are religious-moral crusaders.

- The EEs openly say they believe their actions are more or less pointless and not at all aimed at liberation, therefore their project is a dead-end as far as anarchism is concerned. That does not mean it is not worth learning from.

Italy: Update on Op. "Scripta Manent", and few comments

From Traces of Fire, (Received 4/7/17)

The preliminary hearing for the "Scripta Manent" investigation will be held on 11 and 17/18/19/20 of July. I would like to point out that from 3. June five other comrades of Croce Nera Anarchica, myself, the undersigned of RadioAzione, and the comrade who runs RadioAzione [Croatia] (at the hearing of June 26th it has been decided that she will be tried separately, but still with the same charges), have been added to the comrades already arrested and under investigation.

Looking into the documents relating to the investigation, we have learned that the Public Prosecutor's Office of Naples had opened in 2012 an investigation against me, against an old comrade accused also in the Marini inquiry, and other comrades from Lazio [Italian region] on the subject of Informal Anarchist Federation.

For five years we have been subjected to a total control, which has resulted in including other comrades in the investigation, including the Croatian comrade of RadioAzione. Key-logger installed on computer, wiretapping, tailing even for 600 kilometers... Kind of "if I forgot where I put something, I can ask Agent Elena (the name they gave to the key-logger)".

After five years of fictive control, on 10. January the Public Prosecutor's Office of Naples demanded an arrest for me, the comrade of RadioAzione[Croatia] and two other Greek comrades (one of which is already imprisoned for C.C.F.).

From that moment on, everything has been taken over by the Public Prosecutor's Office of Turin and the prosecutor Sparagna [in charge of Scripta Manent], since the Office of Naples did not have jurisdiction over the crimes we are charged for.

What are we accused of?

Of providing counter-information through web-sites and magazines, translation of claims of responsibility from across the world, of support, sustain, solidarity and complicity with the anarchist comrades Alfredo [Cospito] and Nicola [Gai], raising money for imprisoned comrades. Of having created an Italian-Croatian-Greek cell of F.A.I.

In some parts of the documents, the prosecutor on duty tries to foment the rifts which exist between some of us and the rest of the anarchist movement, and furthermore he invents out of thin air, through wiretapping transcribed in his own way, a disagreement between me and the comrades of CNA [Croce Nera Anarchica], while there has been a full cooperation since the beginning, and I believe that it is the only anarchist journal in Italy worthy of reading, so much so that I am accused of organizing the presentation of this project in Naples. I am saying this just to stop immediately some sharp tongues.

If these are the charges, then:

I claim to have published on the web-site RadioAzione everything in affinity with me. I claim to have given and continue to give Solidarity and Complicity to Alfredo, Nicola and all other comrades-brothers and sisters arrested in September.

I claim to have raised money for the arrested comrades.

I claim to have organized the presentation of Croce Nera Anarchica in Naples, hoping to organize others in the future.

I claim to be anarchist, individualist and for the insurrection!

(Agent Elena, did you copy and photograph everything right? Then, report all to your bosses!)

Somma Gioacchino, July 2017 - (Via : anarhija.info) *read more: <https://tinyurl.com/yckn6rw7>*

A Dialogue on the French and Québécois Contexts

by Francis Dupuis-Déri and Irène Pereira (translated by Jesse Cohn)

Since the publication of Houria Bouteldja's book, *Les Blancs, les Juifs et nous*, in spring 2016 (Paris, La Fabrique [Whites, Jews, and Us, MIT Press/Semiotext(e), 2017]), a controversy surrounding the use of the term "race" has emerged in anarchist circles in France [1]. Those who use such a notion are called "racialist" and likened to racists. This particularly affects the concept of "intersectionality" that comes from the social sciences and has been taken up by activists in order to better articulate our thoughts about different forms of oppression, such as gender, race, and class [2]. Recently, the anarchist group *Regard Noir* [Black Gaze] (since voluntarily dissolved) published, with the Anarchist Federation, a pamphlet titled *Classe, genre, race et anarchisme* [Class, Gender, Race and Anarchism], featuring translations of short texts from the The Women's Caucus of the British Anarchist Federation which help to reflect on the concept – and the phenomenon – of "privileges." [3]

Grand Angle [Wide Shot], a site for anarchist discussion, wished to propose a conversation among anarchists and social scientists, to clear up certain misunderstandings and compare the French and Québécois activist and intellectual contexts. Indeed, Francis Dupuis-Déri is or has been active in organizations of an anarchist orientation in the United States, France, and especially Québec. He teaches political science and women's studies at the University of Québec in Montréal (UQAM) and he has written several books, including *L'Anarchie Expliquée à mon Père* (with Thomas Déri, Montréal, Lux, 2014, forthcoming in English next Fall as *Anarchy Explained to My Father* from New Star Books) and *Les Black Blocs* (Montréal, Lux, 4th ed., 2016, now available in English translation as *Who's Afraid of the Black Blocs?: Anarchy in Action around the World* from PM Press). Irène Pereira has been active in various anarchist organizations (CNT, Alternative Libertaire) and is a member of the editorial collective of the journal *Réfractions*. She teaches in the ESPE at the Université de Créteil and participates in the network "Gender, Race, Class" of the Association Française de Sociologie. She has published, among others, *Anarchistes* (Montreuil, La ville Brule, 2009) and *L'Anarchisme dans les Textes* (Paris, Textuel, 2011).

Irène Pereira: For my part, I'm really amazed at the development of this controversy in anarchist circles in particular because it equates the Party of the Republic's Natives [Parti des Indigènes de la République] (PIR) with positions that it doesn't support, like intersectionality. Indeed, Houria Bouteldja is the author of a text which criticizes the concept of intersectionality [4]. In reality, this text was a response to criticisms of the PIR coming both from Philippe Corcuff [5] and from a collective article written by Malika Amaouche and others [6]. Both contributions, prior to the publication of Houria Bouteldja's controversial book, question the ambiguous positions of PIR on antisemitism and homophobia. So you can see that there is no identity between the fact of supporting PIR and using the sociological concept of "race": this seems to me a mistake that some French anarchist activists have made for lack of knowledge of all the literature on these topics. Actually, intersectionality is a concept that originated in US black feminism. Furthermore, analyses mostly from the perspective of intersectionality try to deconstruct the categories essentialized by various relations of domination, while "essentialism" is now positively embraced by the PIR [7].

read the rest here: <https://tinyurl.com/y7225td5>

About ATUBES

ATUBES is a sporadically produced digest of some of the articles and commentary featured on anarchistnews.org, illustrating some of the breadth of anarchist thinking

<https://anarchistnews.org/>

